



MAIL STOP  
AMENDMENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: A.K. Forsythe Attorney Docket No.: GTDV120953  
Application No.: 10/688,579 Group Art Unit: 3677  
Filed: October 17, 2003 Examiner: A.L. Jackson  
Title: KNOB ATTACHMENT ASSEMBLY

RESPONSE

Seattle, Washington 98101

July 5, 2005

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Applicant submits the following response, and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application at an early date.

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application. In an Office Action mailed January 4, 2005, Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 16-25, and 28-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In view of the remarks that follow, applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 16-25, and 28-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 334,937, issued to Comstock (hereinafter "Comstock"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the foregoing rejections.

It is a well-settled axiom of patent law that in order to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of that claim. Each and every element of a claim must either be expressly or inherently described in a prior art reference.<sup>1</sup> Thus, if every element of the claim is not described or suggested by the reference, the claim cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100